1 2 3	Anna von Herrmann [SBN 301670] Law Office of Anna von Herrmann 2443 Fillmore St. #380-7379 San Francisco, CA 94115 415-779-5619 anna@vonherrmannlegal.com		
4	Abenicio Cisneros [SBN 302765]		
5	Law Offices of Abenicio Cisneros 2443 Fillmore St. #380-7379		
6	San Francisco, CA 94115 707-653-0438 acisneros@capublicrecordslaw.com		
7 8	Attorneys for Petitioners and Plaintiffs KATHERINE MCNENNY and ADRIAN RISKIN		
9			
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
12		.0001111000000	
13	KATHERINE MCNENNY and ADRIAN	) Case No.: BS174784	
14	RISKIN,	EX PARTE APPLICATION OF	
15	Petitioners and Plaintiffs,	) PETITIONERS KATHERINE MCNENNY ) AND ADRIAN RISKIN FOR ORDER	
16 17	vs.  LOS ANGELES CHINATOWN BUSINESS	SHORTENING TIME FOR NOTICE AND MOTION TO COMPEL; DECLARATION OF ANNA VON HERRMANN; PROPOSED ORDER	
	COUNCIL, a non-profit corporation,	)	
18		<ul><li>Department: 86</li><li>Judge: Hon. Mitchell L. Beckloff</li></ul>	
19	Respondent and Defendant.	Petition Filed: August 15, 2018 Date for Hearing on Petition: July 24, 2019	
20		)	
21		TELEPHONE APPEARANCE	
22	PETITIONERS KATHERINE MCNENNY and ADRIAN RISKIN, through their counsel, hereby		
23	apply ex parte for an order shortening time for notice and motion of hearing on Petitioners' motion		
24	to compel responses to Form Interrogatories, Special Interrogatories, Requests for Production of		
25			
26	Documents and Things, and to deem matters specified in Requests for Admission admitted.		
27	- 1	_	
28	EX PARTE APPLICATION OF PETITIONERS KATHERINE MCNENNY AND ADRIAN RISKIN FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR NOTICE AND MOTION TO COMPEL; DECLARATION OF ANNA VON HERRMANN; PROPOSED ORDER		

#### MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## THE COURT IS AUTHORIZED TO SHORTEN TIME FOR NOTICE AND HEARING OF THE PROPOSED MOTION

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

27

27

Code Civ. Proc. § 1005 prescribes the times for written notice of motions and for the service and filing of supporting and opposing papers. However, Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b) provides that "[t]he court, or a judge thereof, may prescribe a shorter time" than otherwise prescribed in § 1005.

California Rules of Court, rule 3.1300(b) states: "The court, on its own motion or on application for an order shortening time supported by a declaration showing good cause, may prescribe shorter times for the filing and service of papers than the time specified in Code of Civil Procedure section 1005."

As stated in the Declaration of Anna von Herrmann submitted herewith, good cause exists to shorten time for the hearing of Petitioner's Motion to Compel in that the earliest available date for a regular noticed motion is not until July of 2019. That is the same month as the hearing on the merits in this case and nearly two months after the deadline for Petitioners' opening brief in the matter.

#### EX PARTE RELIEF IS WARRANTED UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES

An applicant must make an affirmative factual showing in a declaration containing competent testimony based on personal knowledge of irreparable harm, immediate danger, or any other statutory basis for granting relief ex parte. California Rules of Court, rule 3.1202(c). As stated in the Declaration of Anna von Herrmann, filed herewith, irreparable harm will result if Petitioners are not able to have a hearing on the motion to compel until July of 2019.

### COUNSEL HAS FULLY COMPLIED WITH CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT, RULES 3.1203 <u>AND 3.1204</u>

Among other provisions, Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1203 provides as follows:

- 2 -

A party seeking an ex parte order must notify all parties no later than 10:00 a.m. the court day before the ex parte appearance, absent a showing of exceptional circumstances that justify a shorter time for notice. California Rules of Court, rule 3.1203(a).

An ex parte application must be accompanied by a declaration regarding notice stating:

(1) The notice given, including the date, time, manner, and name of the party informed, the relief sought, any response, and whether opposition is expected and that, within the applicable time under rule 3.1203, the applicant informed the opposing party where and when the application would be made; (2) That the applicant in good faith attempted to inform the opposing party but was unable to do so, specifying the efforts made to inform the opposing party; or (3) That, for reasons specified, the applicant should not be required to inform the opposing party. California Rules of Court, rule 3.1204(b).

As stated in the Declaration of Anna von Herrmann, filed herewith, counsel has duly complied with the notice requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 3.1203(a) and California Rules of Court, rule 3.1204(b).

#### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing facts and authorities, and the matters set forth in the Declaration of Anna von Herrmann filed herewith, Petitioners hereby submit that good cause exists for an *ex parte* Order shortening time for notice and hearing of Petitioners' Motion to Compel/Deem Admitted.

Dated: April 29, 2019

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Anna von Herrmann, Esq.

#### DECLARATION OF ANNA VON HERRMANN

In support of this application, I, Anna von Herrmann, state the following based upon personal knowledge:

- 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice before all the courts of the State of California. I am a solo practitioner and the sole attorney of the Law Office of Anna von Herrmann. Along with Abenicio Cisneros, a solo practitioner with the Law Offices of Abenicio Cisneros, I am the attorney of record for Petitioners and Plaintiffs Katherine McNenny and Adrian Riskin ("Petitioners") in this matter. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify as follows:
- On January 23, 2019, Petitioners propounded upon Respondent Form Interrogatories, Special Interrogatories, Requests for Production of Documents and Things, and Requests for Admission.
- 3. On February 20, 2019, having received no response from Respondent to any of the discovery, I mailed a meet and confer letter to Respondent on behalf of Petitioners. In the letter, I reminded Respondent of the February 22, 2019, deadline to respond to the propounded discovery. I expressed my hope that Respondent would properly respond to the propounded discovery so that the issue could be resolved informally without the use of judicial resources. However, I also made clear that Petitioners intended to file a Motion to Compel if Respondent failed to provide responses to the discovery as required by law.
- 4. Respondent has provided Petitioners with no response to any of the propounded discovery at all.

  Respondent did not request any extension of its deadline to respond to discovery. Indeed,

  Petitioners have not received any communication whatsoever from Respondent related to the

  propounded discovery.

- 4 -

- 5. When I attempted to reserve a date on which to have the motion to compel heard, I was informed that the earliest possible date available was in July of 2019. The Hearing on Petition for Writ of Mandate in this matter, which is essentially a trial date, is currently scheduled for July 24, 2019. Petitioners' opening brief on the Petition for Writ of Mandate is due 60 days prior to the hearing. As such, it was necessary for me to bring this application to have the time within which to have a hearing on the motion to compel shortened.
- 6. The delay in hearing the motion to compel/deem admitted until July of 2019 would cause a substantial hardship to Petitioners. Petitioners will suffer irreparable harm if they do not get a ruling on their motion until what is essentially the eve of trial and are as such unable to incorporate discovery responses into their briefing on the merits. Even if Petitioners were to receive responses to their discovery requests just before the hearing on the merits of the case, there would be little if any time to review them and no time to make any further motions should the responses be insufficient.
- 7. Respondent's has not appeared in this matter despite being properly served with the petition. Respondent has not identified any attorney to represent Respondent and no attorney has contacted Petitioners or their counsel on behalf of Respondent.
- 8. I determined that the best phone number to reach Respondent was (213) 680-0243. That is the phone number listed on Respondent's website.
- 9. On, April 29, 2019, at approximately 8:00 a.m., I notified Respondent via telephone with the number noted above that Petitioners would present to this Court on May 2, 2019, at 8:30 a.m., in Department 86 at the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, an application for an order shortening time on hearing Petitioner's motion to compel responses to Petitioner's form interrogatories, special interrogatories, and requests for production, and Petitioner's motion to deem admitted.

10. Respondent did not answer my telephone call, so I left a voicemail message on Respondent's answering machine. In my message, I also inquired as to whether Respondent intended to oppose the application and provided my telephone number for Respondent to contact with additional information or questions. As of this writing, Respondent has not yet provided any response to this communication.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: April **29**, 2019

Anna von Herrmann, Esq.

1		G 11 DG1-1-01	
2	KATHERINE MCNENNY and ADRIAN RISKIN,	Case No.: BS174784	
3	Petitioners and Plaintiffs,	[PROPOSED] ORDER	
4	VS.	Department: 86 Judge: Hon. Mitchell L. Beckloff	
5	LOS ANGELES CHINATOWN BUSINESS	Petition Filed: August 15, 2018	
6	COUNCIL, a non-profit corporation,	Date for Hearing on Petition: July 24, 2019	
7			
8	Respondent and Defendant.		
9			
10			
11	GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFOR;		
12			
13	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the time for service	ce of Petitioners' Motion to Compel/Deem	
14	Admitted is shortened so that service by means of	by a.m./p.m. on	
15			
16	, 2019 to auguagea carriero action of	mo processings recentled mercini	
17			
18	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all papers in opposition must be filed in Department 86 of this		
19	Court, which is the Department in which such matters will be heard, by a.m./p.m. on		
20			
21	a.m./p.m. on, 2019.		
22			
23	Proof of samples of the motion and this order must	ha filad in said Danartmant 86 na latar than	
24	1 roof of service of the motion and this order must be fried in said Department of no later than		
25	a.m./p.m. on, 2019.		
26			
27			
28	- 7		
	EX PARTE APPLICATION OF PETITIONERS KATHER	INF MONENNY AND ADRIAN RISKIN FOR ORDER	

EX PARTE APPLICATION OF PETITIONERS KATHERINE MCNENNY AND ADRIAN RISKIN FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR NOTICE AND MOTION TO COMPEL;
DECLARATION OF ANNA VON HERRMANN; PROPOSED ORDER

1	The date of hearing Petitioners' Motion to Compel/Deem Admitted shall be, 2019 at
2	a.m./p.m. in Department 86.
3	
4	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED:
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	Dated:
10	
11	
12	Judge of the Superior Court
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22   23	
23   24	
25	
26	
27	
28	- 8 -
	EX PARTE APPLICATION OF PETITIONERS KATHERINE MCNENNY AND ADRIAN RISKIN FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR NOTICE AND MOTION TO COMPEL; DECLARATION OF ANNA VON HERRMANN; PROPOSED ORDER